1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

S 6 PUBLIC SCHOOLF COMMISSION

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM O. RICHARDSON

E C E I V UTLUTIES DEPARTMENT

FOR

THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF SOUTH CAROLINA

DOCKET NO. 97-004-E

IN RE: SOUTH CAROLINA ELECTRIC & GAS COMPANY

- Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR NAME, ADDRESS AND OCCUPATION?
- A. William O. Richardson, 111 Doctors Circle, Columbia,
 South Carolina. I am employed by the Public Service
 Commission of South Carolina, Utilities Department
 as an Engineer Associate.
- Q. WOULD YOU PLEASE STATE YOUR EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND
 AND YOUR BUSINESS EXPERIENCE?
- Ι B.S. Degree Electrical Α. received а in Computer Engineering from Clemson University I was employed, upon graduation, by Daniel 1975. Construction Company as Electrical Engineer in an Power Division. In 1978 I was employed by this Commission as a Utilities Engineer Associate II. February 1991 I was promoted to Utilities Engineer Associate III. I have attended various courses and related to engineering, life analysis and accounting relationships and have testified before this Commission in other proceedings involving fuel

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29203

COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA 29203

HAVE YOU DETERMINED THAT

25

Q.

WARRANT

ANY SITUATIONS

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

HAS ACTED IN OPERATING ITS FACILITIES AND BY SO TO BE SUBJECT TO

- The nuclear averaged 87.4% capacity factor for the period, which a refueling outage. The major fossil units over 90% availability for the majority of as indicated on Utilities Staff also examined utility achieved an adjusted capacity factor for the period under review of 92.5% as required by the statute to presume cost minimization. Including a reasonable refueling outage, the nuclear generation systems net capacity factor 96.8%, rose to exceeding the statutory requirement threshold of 92.5% to presume minimization.
- Q. HAS STAFF DETERMINED THAT ANY CHANGES TO THE FOR FUEL COSTS TARIFF NEED TO BE MADE AT ADJUSTMENT THE PRESENT TIME?
- Yes. the Adjustment for Fuel Costs Tariff, Exhibit 8, should have the language deleted that states the succeeding six months or shorter period:".

6 7

8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

25

This is due to the change in the statute that requires a 12 month (annual) review period instead the 6 months (semi-annual review) period.

- Q. WOULD YOU BRIEFLY EXPLAIN THE REMAINING UTILITIES
 DEPARTMENT'S EXHIBITS?
- Α. Exhibit No. 2 shows the Company's Unit Outages for months οf March 1996 through February 1997, listing the plants by unit, duration of the outage. for the outage, and corrective action taken. reason Exhibit No. 3 lists the Company's percentage Generation Mix by fossil, nuclear, and hydro for the period March 1996 through February 1997. Exhibit 4 reflects the Company's major plants by name, of fuel used, average fuel cost in cents KWH to operate, and total megawatt-hours generated for the twelve months ending February No. 5 shows a comparison of the Company's original retail megawatt-hour estimated sales to the actual sales for the period under review. Exhibit 6 is a comparison of the original fuel projections to the factors actually experienced for the twelve months ending February 1997. Exhibit No. graphical representation of the is including historical and projected No. 6 for the period through April 1998. Exhibit

No. 8 is the Company's currently approved Retail Adjustment for Fuel Costs tariff. Exhibit No. 9 is history of the cumulative recovery account. Exhibit No. 10 is a table of estimates for cumulative recovery account balance for various base levels of fuel factors for the period ending April 1998. DOES THIS CONCLUDE YOUR TESTIMONY? Yes, it does.